



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5620
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF RISK MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN RICE PRODUCTION IN ABIA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Empirical study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	(i) The method of selecting farmers in the methodology is faulty using random technique, without specifying. You can only use simple random technique when you select from a known population. (ii) Some of the data in Table 1 were scientifically wrong. How can you have a mean value of sex to be 0.7333? You are either a male or a female. Your discussion on sex is not in line with the data you provided in the table, ... that 76.33% are male. (iii) Also, how come the minimum age of your respondents is 14 years old when you have already indicated earlier on pg.6 line 185 that you used experienced rice producers? Very doubting if at all you followed the principles you stated in your work? (iv) You cannot get the mean size of household to be 5.600 at all, see your finding on table 1 and your discussion on pg.9 line 276. Does it mean you can divide person and get half? (v) How can low technology constitute a risk? See table 2 line 296. Even the concept of using pest and disease as a risk was not properly explained. Since this was the major risk factor, there's need to address it properly not just listing it. NOTE also that this is the major purpose of the study. (vi) Since source of risk was capture initially on frequency and percentage form, how did you arrived at the mean score you now have in Table 4 line 376? (vii) Your recommendation(s) needs to be specific. For example, how will government ensure availability of	The population is already obvious to the enumerators and are specified as rice farmers in two rice producing communities making random sampling the best technique for selecting the respondents. Comments ii-iv: It seems the reviewers may not be too conversant with the use of mean. The result in the table is scientifically and statistically correct. Take for example a mean of sex could be less than one (1) if dummy was used to capture it, hence will give a decimal figure. Secondly, the mean age of 42.7166 is an indication that the sampled rice farmers were experienced and have practiced rice production within mean period of 18.28 years. The respondents with age of 14 years may not have significant impact on the pool since some of the respondents were up to 70 to give mean age of 42.7166. The same applies for household size. For the sake of clarity, <u>mean</u> is simply described as central tendency which is obtained by dividing the sum of observations with sample size so may give decimal number, which gives the clear attribute of the pool sampled rice producers. (V) The meaning and sources of risk are well explained in the background to be factors that hinder realization of production target and return which could be low technology, pest and diseases.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	pesticide? and improve seedlings at subsidize rate?	All these are well explained in the work. The reviewer may need to properly go through the paper. (VI) The risk sources were initially captured with descriptive statistics but according to the paper and other relevant literature, descriptive statistics may give a misleading result hence the use of higher econometric model to validate the result of ranking which further generated the mean score in table four. (VII) The recommendations are specific as government can address the highlighted risk sources through the recommended policy initiatives in the paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The abstract need to be revisited. The introductory sentences are too many. Avoid the use of citation in the abstract	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Writing pattern needs to be improved. Serious major revision is required.	